THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

18 April 2002

AM 10:00 **CONVENE**, Suite 312, 441 F Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20001

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of minutes: 21 March 2002

B. Dates of next meetings: 16 May 2002
20 June 2002

C. Report on the dedication of the George Mason National Memorial.

D. Report on the first lighting mockup for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

E. Introduction of new staff member, John P. Lukavic, Administrative Support Assistant.

F. Introduction of Beth Callow, Professional Development Intern from the Department of the Navy.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. National Park Service /American Battle Monuments Commission

CFA 18 APR 02- 1, Vietnam Veterans Memorial Commemorative Plaque. Vietnam Veterans Memorial. Site selection and design. (Previous: CFA 21/JUN/01- 5).

B. National Park Service

1. CFA 18 APR 02- 2, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. National Memorial. Independence Avenue at the northwestern rim of the Tidal Basin. Concept. (Previous: CFA 21/JUN/01- 3).

2. CFA 18 APR 02- 3, National Mall. 3rd to 14th streets along Madison Drive; both side sides of 4th Street; and the center walk between the National Gallery of Art and the Air and Space Museum. Walkway improvements. Final (Previous: CFA 17/APR/97-2).

C. General Services Administration

1. CFA 18 APR 02- 4, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms Headquarters. New York and Florida Avenues, NE. New building. Concept development. (Previous: CFA 15/NOV/01-1).

2. CFA 18 APR 02- 5, American Pharmaceutical Association. 2215 Constitution Avenue, NW. Five-story rear addition. Revised concept. (Previous: S.L. 02- 028, 21 February 2002).

3. CFA 18 APR 02- 6, U.S. Court of Military Appeals. 450 E Street, NW (Judiciary Square). Replacement chiller and cooling tower. Design.

4. CFA 18 APR 02- 7, Department of Education (FOB 6). Maryland Avenue between 4th and 6th streets, SW. Guard booths and retractable bollards at garage entrances. Design.

5. CFA 18 APR 02- 8, Department of Labor. Frances C. Perkins Building. 200 Constitution Avenue, NW. Replacement handrails. Design.

D. District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority

CFA 18 APR/02- 9, St. Elizabeths Hospital (East Campus). 2700 Martin Luther King, Jr. Avenue, SE. Replacement water storage facility. Design.

E. District of Columbia Public Schools / U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

CFA 18 APR 02- 10, Bell Multicultural High School / Lincoln Multicultural Middle School. 3145 Hiatt Place, NW / 3101 16th Street, NW. New combined school building. Final. (Previous: CFA 20/SEP/01-15).

F. District of Columbia Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

1. Old Georgetown Act

Appendix I.

2. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. S.L. 02-056. 5800 Block* Oregon Avenue, NW (Lot 2). New single family dwelling. Concept.
* number not assigned

b. S.L. 02-059. 4800 Block* Broad Branch Road, NW (Lot 34). New single family dwelling. Concept.
* number not assigned

c. Appendix II.

OLD GEORGETOWN SUBMISSIONS
RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 01-226 HPA. 01-464	3050 West Lane Keys, NW Neil Roger Residence	Second floor deck on rear - conceptual

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to concept design for proposed metal and wood deck at third floor level (second floor level above rear garden) as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 21 March 2002, which indicate metal railing. File new submission of working drawings, including details for deck and fence, with permit application for review by the Commission when ready.

O.G. 02-35 HPA. 02-54	2739 O Street, NW Mia Lovink Residence	Driveway and parking pad in front - conceptual

RECOMMENDATION: Returned without Action. Case superseded by case O.G. 02-171.

O.G. 02-89 HPA. 02-124	3303 Water Street, NW 3303 K Street, LLC East Banc, Inc	New residential building - design concept development - conceptual

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to development of details for concept design for proposed new residential building at the Pepco site, including handicapped access ramp of 33rd Street entrance, penthouse screen, balcony and terrace railings as shown in Option 1 of supplemental drawings received 26 March 2002. Recommend further study of a deeper steel support beam on lintel of car port openings. No objection to development of details for roof terraces and soldier brick lintel of punched window openings as shown on Scheme B of supplemental drawings received 27 February 2002. No objection to concept design for landscape plan, including lattice walls used to screen the existing Pepco Substation from garden terraces as shown in drawings received 21 December 2001. File new submission of completed working drawings, including details and material samples, with permit application for review by the Commission when ready.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 02-117 HPA. 02-170	1251 Wisconsin Avenue, NW Khosrow Mizrahi Skechers	Replacement of side stairs and stabilization of building - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations, including reconstruction of exterior stairs with brick to match existing, and new brick stoops with metal railings for entry doors at second floor level. Relocation of previously approved mechanical equipment on roof at rear has been deleted from this application. File separate submission of working drawings, including details, for proposed alterations to storefront and sign, with permit application for review by the Commission when ready.

O.G. 02-140 HPA. 02-226	1324 27th Street, NW Lori Trautwine Residence	2-story rear addition - revised design - conceptual

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to concept design for proposed 2-story rear addition as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 27 March 2002, which indicate a 10'-3" addition with a two foot setback from North property line, alterations to front for a new brick stoop and a 7'-0" high brick garden wall at rear. File new submission of working drawings, including details and material samples, with permit application for review by the Commission when ready. Recommend further study of 9" gap between proposed addition and neighbor's structure and of structural condition of historic walls prior to next submission.

O.G. 02-145 HPA. 02-231	1631 35th Street, NW John and Lindsey Akridge Residence	Alterations to windows, garden fence and parking pad with gate - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for alterations to window opening and new windows, for wood fence and arbor on rear yard, for brick piers and wood board fence on alley and along sidewalk, and for parking pad with wood board swing gate to screen it from street as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 14 March 2002. Wood fence along sidewalk will replace and match height of existing fence on public space. Note is made that permit application is pending final zoning review. Any modifications to the approved design as a result of further review in the permit process must be submitted to the Commission for approval.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 02-148 HPA. ??	3316 M Street, NW, rear East Banc, Inc Design Center West	Light fixtures - permit

RECOMMENDATION: Recommend **AGAINST** issuance of permit for proposed light fixtures and mounting bracket. Proposed fixture is appropriate for locations where projecting screen exist, but not for residential installation. Recommend further study of alternative light fixtures. See review of case O.G. 00-50 for details of previously approved light fixture. File new submission of working drawings, including details of mounting alternatives, with permit application for review by the Commission when ready.

O.G. 02-149 HPA. 02-240	2803 Q Street, NW Stiglitz Residence Residence	Alterations to terrace and landscaping on rear - permit

RECOMMENDATION: Returned without Action. Supplemental drawings received and dated 1 April 2002 and a site visit of 20 March 2002 indicate that proposed retaining wall and terrace on rear yard, in coordination with new landscaping, will not be visible from public thoroughfare. Refer to the Historic Preservation Review Board. Alterations to front steps were deleted from this permit application. Note is made that permit application is pending final zoning review.

O.G. 02-157 HPA. 02-268	3206 N Street, NW Paul Cohn Prospect Place	Two-story glass in-fill on walkway - conceptual

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to concept design for proposed two-story glass in-fill of walkway as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 22 March 2002. Recommend use of clear glass. File new submission of working drawings, including details and material samples, with permit application for review by the Commission when ready.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 02-158 HPA. 02-269	1041 Wisconsin Avenue, NW Grace Episcopal Church	Handicapped access ramps and alterations to walkways - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations, including new stone-faced handicapped access ramp from South Street, new entrances from alley and Wisconsin Avenue, new flagstone paving on walks and patio, new iron fences and gates to match detailing of existing fences, and new brick sidewalk to match brick of sidewalk on Wisconsin Avenue. Working drawings conform to approved concept design. See previous Recommendation (O.G. 01-174). Note is made that permit application is pending final zoning review. Any modifications to the approved design as a result of further review in the permit process must be submitted to the Commission for approval. File separate submission of detail drawings for lighting plan with permit application for review by the Commission when ready.

O.G. 02-159 HPA. 02-270	1228 27th Street, NW Pecali and Berkeley Phillips Row Residence	Enclosure of rear balcony - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed enclosure of rear balcony with new doble hung windows to match existing windows elsewhere, as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 4 April 2002. Note is made that permit application is pending final zoning review. Any modifications to the approved design as a result of further review in the permit process must be submitted to the Commission for approval.

O.G. 02-160 HPA. 02-272	3010 Cambridge Place, NW Charles and Susan Moore Residence	Enclose rear porch and add deck over porch - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations, including enclosure of rear porch, new wood deck on roof of porch, relocation of existing rear windows on new openings on side wall, removal of vent under windows and brick in-fill of openings. Working drawings conform to approved concept. See previous Recommendation (O.G. 02-132). Note is made that permit application is pending final zoning review. Any modifications to the approved design as a result of further review in the permit process must be submitted to the Commission for approval.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 02-161 HPA. 02-273	1242 Wisconsin Avenue, NW Max Studio.com	Alterations to storefront, awning and sign - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed alterations to storefront, sign composed of 8 3/4-inch high back-lit pin-mounted brushed aluminum letters reading "Max Studio.com", and fabric awning PROVIDED installation meets code. Working drawings conform to approved concept design. See previous Recommendation (O.G. 02-111).

O.G. 02-162 HPA. 02-274	1334 28th Street, NW Waterman and Robroy Residence	Wood gate on brick garden wall - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed wood board gate on existing brick garden wall with steps to match existing steps on nearby gate, as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 16 April 2002. Note is made that permit application is pending final zoning review. Any modifications to the approved design as a result of further review in the permit process must be submitted to the Commission for approval.

O.G. 02-163 HPA. 02-275	1524 35th Street, NW Georgetown Visitation Preparatory School St. Bernard Library	Replacement windows - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed replacement of existing aluminum windows and doors at the St. Bernard Library building within the Georgetown Visitation Preparatory School with aluminum clad wood windows and doors, PROVIDED the number of vertical mullions on bay window is reduced by one as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated April 2002. Note is made that permit application is pending final zoning review. Any modifications to the approved design as a result of further review in the permit process must be submitted to the Commission for approval.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 02-167 HPA. 02-279	3068 Q Street, NW Eugene T. Lyddane Residence	Replacement windows and metal railing in front, and rear alterations - permit

RECOMMENDATION: Recommend **AGAINST** issuance of permit for proposed installation of metal railing at third floor above front bay window and for proposed replacement of existing wood windows with tilt-in replacement sash kits which would introduce a second frame into the existing and are not appropriate. Recommend further study of a more appropriate replacement wood window. No objection to issuance of permit for alterations to rear, including removal of lean-to structure at rear and toothed-in brick in-fill of openings with brick to match existing. File new submission of working drawings, including details and specifications for alternative replacement windows, with new permit application for review by the Commission when ready. Note is made that permit application is pending final zoning review. Any modifications to the approved design as a result of further review in the permit process must be submitted to the Commission for approval.

O.G. 02-169 HPA. 02-297	3304 O Street, NW Jacqueline Pletcher Residence	Replacement board fence and brick patio - permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed brick patio for parking pad and for new 7'-0" high cedar board fence which will replace existing stockade fence, will match previously approved fence and double gate, and will be stained. See previous Recommendation (O.G. 02-71). Fence supports will not be visible from public thoroughfare.

O.G. 02-173 HPA. 02-309	3035 Dumbarton Street, NW Dale Owen Overmyer, AIA Residence	Excavation of basement, removal of rear stairs and concrete patio - permit

RECOMMENDATION: Returned without Action. Submitted materials indicate that proposed work, including excavation of basement, underpinning, replacement foundation, removal of rear basement stairs and replacement of concrete patio, will not be visible from public thoroughfare. Refer to the Historic Preservation Review Board. Note is made that permit application is pending final zoning review.

SHIPSTEAD-LUCE SUBMISSIONS
RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 02-051 HPA. 02-287	2608 Tilden Street, NW Peoples Republic of China	Window replacement - Permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to the issuance of permit for proposed replacement windows as shown in drawings received and dated 5 April 2002. (See previous Recommendation: S.L. 01-076).

S.L. 02-052 HPA. 02-286	2600 Tilden Street, NW Peoples Republic of China	Window replacement - Permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to the issuance of permit for proposed replacement windows as shown in drawings received and dated 5 April 2002. (See previous Recommendation: S.L. 01-077).

S.L. 02-053 HPA. 02-288	300 Massachusetts Avenue, NW at H Street (Sq. 529) Massachusetts Court Apartments	New 14-story apartment building - Permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for new 14-story apartment building with ground level retail space on H and 4th streets, and the preservation of three historic structures at the corner of H and 3rd streets as shown in drawings received and dated 5 April 2002. Working drawings conform to approved concept. Note is made that application for permit is pending final zoning review. Any modifications to the approved design as a result of further review in the permit process must be submitted to the Commission for approval. See previous Recommendation (S.L. 00-015)

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 02-054	1811 Quincy Street, NW G. Chaconas Residence	Replacement two-story garden shed - Permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to the issuance of permit for proposed two-story brick and wood frame garden shed to replace a previously existing shed as shown in drawings received and dated 1 April 2002.

S.L. 02-055 HPA. 02-308	1100 Maine Avenue, SW White Sea Food	Gas lines and meter vault - Permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to the issuance of permit for the temporary installation of proposed gas and utility lines and meter vault as shown in drawings received and dated 5 April 2002, provided future work be coordinated with the fish-cleaning house restoration project and the D.C. Housing and Community Development Authority. Otherwise, recommend underground runs for all utility lines and in the future not attaching lines to the exterior of the fish-cleaning house. File new submission of working drawings for permanent installation with permit applications for review by the Commission when ready.

S.L. 02- 057 HPA. 02-314	700 Water Street, SW Zanzibar on the Waterfront, LLC	New windows, extension of stairwell to roof-top, and observation decks - Permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for new windows, extension of stairwell to roof-top and observation decks on flat roofs as shown in drawings received 5 April 2002. (See previous Recommendation: S.L. 98-092).

S.L.02-058	1719 G Street, NW Carr Realty, LP The Exchange Restaurant	Sidewalk café - Permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to the issuance of public space permit for sidewalk café with nine (9) tables and solid colored umbrellas without advertising logos or letters as shown in drawings received and dated 5 April 2002.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 02-060 HPA. 02-293	2306 & 2308 Massachusetts Avenue, NW Embassy of Latvia Alice P. Barney Studio House	Exterior renovations and replacement windows - Concept

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to the concept design for the proposed exterior renovations and replacement windows as shown in drawings received and dated 5 April 2002, provided replacement windows on front elevation match profiles of existing windows. File new submission of working drawings with permit application, for review by the Commission when ready.

S.L. 02-061 HPA. 02-311	2200 Massachusetts Avenue, NW Embassy of Luxembourg	New stair, handicap lift, in expanded areaway to basement - Permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for new stair and handicap lift in expanded areaway and other minor exterior renovations as shown in drawings received and dated 5 April 2002. Note is made that application for permit is pending final zoning review. Any modifications to the approved design as a result of further review in the permit process must be submitted to the Commission for approval.

S.L. 02-062	500 C Street, NW (555 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW) The Freedom Forum The Newseum	Temporary signs - Permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for temporary signs announcing the future home of the Newseum and the Freedom Forum as shown in drawings received and dated 10 April 2002. Working drawings conform to approved concept. (See previous Recommendation: S.L. 02-040.)

S.L. 02-063 HPA. 02-324	1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW 1747 Penn Ave. Assoc. LP Sprint	Roof top antennas and equipment cabinet - Permit

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to issuance of permit for proposed roof top antennas as shown in drawings received and dated 11 April 2002, provided the antennas and equipment cabinet are painted to match the color of the adjacent wall of the penthouse.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

18 April 2002

The meeting was convened at 10:10 a.m. in the Commission of Fine Arts offices in the National Building Museum, 441 F Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001, after a tour of project sites.

Members present: Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman
Hon. Harry G. Robinson, Vice-Chairman
Hon. Carolyn Brody
Hon. Donald A. Capoccia
Hon. Barbaralee Diamonstein-Spielvogel
Hon. Pamela Nelson
Hon. Eden Rafshoon

Staff present: Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary
Mr. Frederick J. Lindstrom, Assistant Secretary
Ms. Sue Kohler
Mr. José Martínez-Canino
Ms. Susan Raposa

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of the minutes of the 21 March meeting. This item was postponed until later in the meeting.

B. Dates of next meetings, approved as:

16 May
20 June

C. Report on the dedication of the George Mason National Memorial. The Assistant Secretary commented on the dedication ceremonies, at which Chief Justice Rehnquist was the keynote speaker and Senator George Allen and Representative Thomas M. Davis III, both from Virginia, also spoke; he then showed photos taken during the ceremonies.

D. Report on the first lighting mockup for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. Mr. Lindstrom said the Chairman and Vice-Chairman, as well as several members of the staff, had attended one or both of the two demonstrations held. He noted that the current small, pyramidal lights, set in the pavement, produced a rather spotty lighting, and were a trip hazard as well as having water problems. He said three or four different lamp types were demonstrated, all of which would be flush-mounted in the existing locations, would provide better illumination for the names, and would be less yellow and thus more complimentary to the black granite. The Chairman recalled that a sophisticated lens would allow a wash of light without the light source being visible or shining in the eyes of visitors. The Secretary added that there would be a full-scale mockup for the Commission members on the evening before the next Commission meeting.

E. Introduction of new staff member, John P. Lukavic, Administrative Support Assistant. Mr. Lindstrom introduced Mr. Lukavic, noting that he had a master's degree in museum science, had been an ethics intern with the American Association of Museums in Washington, a research intern with the International Council of Museums in Paris, and until the past week, a temporary employee with the Commission. Mr. Lukavic was then welcomed as a permanent member of the Commission staff.

F. Introduction of Beth Callow, Professional Development Intern. Mr. Lindstrom said Ms. Callow was a professional career development intern with the Department of the Navy; she had been in the Navy for ten years before getting a degree in landscape architecture at the University of Maryland and then joining the civilian staff at the Navy Yard. She had been placed with the Commission for an internship of several months as part of her professional training. Ms. Callow was then welcomed by the members.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. National Park Service/American Battle Monuments Commission

CFA 18/APR/02-1, Vietnam Veterans Memorial commemorative plaque, Vietnam Veterans Memorial. Site selection and design. (Previous: CFA 21/JUN/01-5) The Assistant Secretary recalled that the design shown previously had been withdrawn because of objections made by the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund, and now there was a new design that met the approval of both the ABMC and the VVMF. He asked John Parsons from the Park Service to begin the presentation.

Mr. Parsons said the legislation authorizing this addition stated that it should be in the form of a plaque, and now the question was where to put it. He said the Park Service was excited about the proposed location, and he introduced Ken Pond from the ABMC. Mr. Pond said the proposal had been endorsed by the ABMC and the National Capital Memorial Commission and had the full support of the three organizations responsible for its development–the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund, represented by Jan Scruggs, the Vietnam War In Memory Memorial, represented by Ruth Carter Fitzgerald, and the Vietnam Women's Memorial. He asked Jan Scruggs to introduce the professional team.

Mr. Scruggs said they were proud of the design to be submitted as a worthy addition to the Mall, and he hoped it could be dedicated in November on Veterans Day. He said landscape architects

Henry Arnold and George Dickie had both had professional involvement with Constitution Gardens and the Mall, and he praised J.C. Cummings's skills as an architect. He asked Mr. Cummings to begin the design presentation

Mr. Cummings outlined the objectives–to preserve the existing memorial, honorably commemorate those named on the plaque, and consider good design practices. He said a site analysis was performed by Henry Arnold's firm, and he asked Mr. Arnold to comment on that. Mr. Arnold said they first looked at how people approached the memorial, because circulation was so important in locating the plaque, and then considered areas that would have an impact on the existing memorial, areas of maximum activity and sensitivity, and questions of vision–to the memorial, from the Vietnam Women's Memorial, and to the Lincoln Memorial and Washington Monument. He showed drawings diagraming all these considerations. Using the information gained from these diagrams, they identified three possible sites, using the following criteria: the site had to connect to the pedestrian flow in the area of maximum activity; it had to be in view of the other components of the memorial but not in the zone incompatible with these components; it should not interfere with the main pedestrian flow and should allow enough paved area for people to gather; it should have enough space for temporary accumulation of mementoes after big occasions; it should minimize pedestrian barriers such as the existing chains to keep people off the lawn; and it should not set a precedent for locating future additions.

Three sites were then evaluated: Site A was located at the intersection of the paths just to the southeast of the Three Servicemen plaza; Site B was in the northeast corner of the plaza itself; Site C was south of the memorial and to the west of Site A. It was determined that Site B met all the criteria, and that was the one being recommended to the Commission. He said they had worked with the architect to make sure that an appropriate plaque could be designed for that site, and he asked J.C. Cummings to describe how he had arrived at his design.

Mr. Cummings said he and George Dickie had analyzed the existing memorial and determined that its key factors, as far as designing the plaque was concerned, were that the memorial was made up of a collection of elements set in an informal arrangement, like an English garden, and that, although not intentional, there was a sense of discovery as the visitor experienced the memorial. Also, the memorial was an example of clean, abstract modernism, and it was important to acknowledge and preserve that. Considering these factors, they both concurred that Site B was the best choice; also, anything placed outside the plaza area would require a sense of place that didn't exist, and it would be distracting to the existing memorial. The proposal was to enlarge the plaza slightly and to add another peripheral paving stone at the end, centering the dark grey granite plaque, flush, on the last two stones. The typeface for the inscription would be the same as that used on the Wall, although larger for legibility from a standing position. He noted that the plaque would be easily discoverable to a visitor entering the plaza, but out of view to those entering the memorial, and not in the way of those photographing the statue; finally, he observed that it would require very little maintenance.

The Chairman asked how much the plaza would have to be enlarged, and Mr. Cummings said by only 3 feet. Mr. Brown said he would like to comment for the record that the Commission visited the Washington Monument before the meeting, and as he looked down on Constitution Gardens he thought how fortunate it was that President Nixon's idea of turning that area into a theme park did not come to pass; he said he wanted once again to congratulate Henry Arnold on his design of one of the most beautiful parks in the country. He asked for any other comments, and hearing none, asked for a motion to approve. Ms. Diamonstein made the motion, it was seconded by Mrs. Brody and carried unanimously. Exhibit A

B. National Park Service

1. CFA 18/APR.02-2, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., National Memorial, Independence Avenue at the northwestern rim of the Tidal Basin. Concept. (Previous: CFA 21/JUN/01-3) The Assistant Secretary introduced John Parsons, who said the Park Service would like to suggest some changes to the concept design and get the Commission's reaction before they moved forward with them. He then introduced LeRoy Lowery, the executive director of the foundation, to make some opening remarks.

Mr. Lowery said he had been working conceptually on the design since 1988, and he wanted to acknowledge the presence of Al Bailey, who was one of those who first conceived the idea of the memorial, back in 1983. Mr. Lowery said he thought the suggestions made earlier by this commission and the planning commission had been addressed, and he asked Dr. Ed Jackson from the foundation, an architect by profession, to discuss the revisions proposed.

Dr. Jackson showed slides, first to give an overview of the principal elements of the design, then to show the refinements currently being suggested. The principal design elements shown were the primary entrance at the intersection of Independence Avenue and West Basin Drive; the large split rock entrance portal, called the Mountain of Despair, through which visitors would pass into the major open space of the memorial; the Stone of Hope within this space, on which the image of Dr. King would be carved; the crescent-shaped water wall enclosing the space; the niches in the wall containing historic inscriptions; the "nave" on the upper level of the wall; and the view of the Tidal Basin in the direction of the Jefferson Memorial from this upper level. Dr. Jackson also described the landscaping plan, which would add a rich variety of trees, shrubs, and flowers, including additional cherry trees. The water's edge would not be altered.

Turning to the design refinements, Dr. Jackson said first that they would do a thorough study of traffic, especially along Independence Avenue, with a view to enhancing the visual experience of that avenue from the memorial; he said the arc of the wall seemed to them to come too close to Independence Avenue as presently designed. They would also study parking, and would recommend that there be no permanent parking along West Basin Drive. Pedestrian movement in and out of the memorial would also be analyzed, secondary entrances at each end of the arc would be enhanced, and the Park Service had suggested the possible use of post and chain fencing to discourage movement from the sidewalks up to the back of the memorial.

Major changes were recommended for the wall, including lowering it and removing both the pathway and bridge along the top. If that were done, then it was likely that all the niches would be removed. The Stone of Hope would remain the centerpiece of the memorial; as designed, he said, it would be about 20-25 feet high, and would consist of a piece taken from the middle of a larger stone, leaving the two end pieces to form the Mountain of Despair. The Stone of Hope would be oriented in a more southerly direction than originally proposed, so that Dr. King could be seen whether the visitor entered through the main portal or from the water's edge. That concluded Dr. Jackson's presentation, and he asked for comments.

Questions were asked by Ms. Diamonstein and Mrs. Nelson about inscriptions, now that the niches would likely be eliminated. Dr. Jackson said they would follow the Commission's previous recommendation that any inscriptions should refer to Dr. King only, not to other civil rights leaders, but they had not yet made any final determination where these inscriptions would be. The Vice-Chairman thought the orientation of the Stone of Hope was of utmost importance; he observed that if it were placed in a true south position it would lose the tension that it needed, and would seem to be lined up with the orthogonal grid of the city streets. He also thought the distance between the wall and the Stone of Hope was a very critical one, and it should not be cramped. The Chairman

questioned whether the city grid would still be in the mind of the visitor, once he had entered the curvilinear form of the memorial, but he agreed that some dynamic tension was necessary. He suggested that this kind of problem could best be worked out on the site. There were questions from the Vice-Chairman and Ms. Diamonstein about changes of grade within the memorial, and whether stairs would be necessary to reach it from street level. Dr. Jackson said there would be only ramps, that the memorial would be completely ADA compliant. He also noted that they were aware of circulation patterns and would provide exits that would allow visitors to leave the memorial without having to go back through it. He was asked if the Stone of Hope would actually be cut out of the same boulder as the Mountain of Despair, and he said it would; at this point, he said, they expected it would be granite, but they had not gone into what kind of granite might be used.

Mrs. Brody asked for comments from the Park Service and also asked if the Commission could visit the site before the next presentation; she thought the design had progressed to the point where it would be useful. Mr. Parsons said the Park Service was very supportive of removing the niches and the bridge; he said the latter seemed to violate a "sacred space", and he compared it to walking on top of the wall of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. The Vice-Chairman asked him if he was concerned that the memorial would block views across the Tidal Basin. Mr. Parsons said he was initially, but with the lowering of the wall and pulling back of the arc, he thought the situation was improved, but he agreed with the Chairman that section drawings would help determine just how seriously the views would be blocked. Ms. Diamonstein questioned whether the size of the Mountain of Despair might contribute to blocking the view; she asked for the dimensions but was told that although they hadn't been determined yet, the size would certainly be considered with the view problem in mind. The Chairman commented on another aspect of the Mountain of Despair that concerned him. He thought it important that the opening not be widened too much even if it were uncomfortable, because of the importance of the experience of going through a very narrow space and then emerging into the open space of the memorial. He compared it to the ancient site of Petra in Jordan, where one must travel through a very constricted opening in the rock before the site is revealed. Mrs. Rafshoon agreed, and added that she was not overly concerned with blocking the view of the Tidal Basin from one point on Independence Avenue because the surprise of seeing it open up made for a more exciting experience.

There were no further questions or comments, and the Chairman summarized the Commission's conclusions. He said it was his sense that the members thought the design showed great promise and the changes were heading in the right direction. He noted some concern about the orientation of the Stone of Hope and its distance from the Mountain of Despair, and about making sure that visitors did not try to leave the memorial the same way they came in, but in general he thought there was great enthusiasm about what had been presented. Exhibit B

2. CFA 18/APR/02-3, National Mall, 3rd to 14th streets along Madison Drive; both sides of 4th Street; and the center walk between the National Gallery of Art and the Air and Space Museum. Walkway improvements. Final. (Previous: CFA 17/APR/97-2) Staff member José Martínez said this project had been ongoing since 1995; at that time the Park Service was responding to a lawsuit involving handicapped access on the Mall, and was trying to find a better solution for the surface of the Mall paths than the existing loose gravel. The Commission approved a proposal in 1996 which was put in place on the south side of the Mall, and now the Park Service was ready to do the north side. He introduced John Parsons to review the approved scheme and talk about the proposal to continue it.

Mr. Parsons showed drawings of the 1996 scheme, noting that only a strip 11-feet wide was paved in accessible exposed aggregate; the rest remained surfaced in gravel. He said they had been

waiting for sufficient funding to continue the work, and although funding for the entire project would not be available until 2006 at the earliest, they were bringing the Commission an interim solution to help ease the situation for those who needed it. The first aspect would be a walkway between the National Gallery of Art and the Air and Space Museum. It would be 40-feet wide with a middle panel, 15-feet wide, of exposed aggregate; later, the two outer wings would be added. The Chairman asked why such a wide walkway was needed, and Mr. Parsons said that, at the time, the Commission and the Park Service had agreed that the three major north-south walkways should be that wide, although he was not sure they would still agree to that. Turning to 4th Street, Mr. Parsons pointed out that the new District sidewalks on this street as it met Madison Drive varied from others in that they were placed against the curb rather than having a parking strip. Therefore, rather than going ahead with the 4th Street walks in the position approved in 1996, they had moved them so that they would line up with the District sidewalks.

The Chairman said he would have no objection to the proposal; ideally, he said, the paths would be entirely of the gravel and earth variety, as they were in the Tuileries and other French parks, but he realized that as installed on the Mall, they were difficult to navigate by those in wheelchairs. He did hope that before the Park Service paved over any more lawn, they would come back to the Commission, because he thought a 40-foot-wide " landing strip" on the Mall would be an eyesore. Mr. Parsons said that was what was there now, and the 15-foot-wide strip of exposed aggregate would be put right down the middle. There was agreement that there would be no objection to this as an interim measure, with the Chairman saying that the Commission would take another look when the permanent installation was submitted. Exhibit C

C. General Services Administration

1. CFA 18/APR/02-4, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms Headquarters, New York and Florida avenues, N.E. New building, concept development. (Previous: CFA 15/NOV/01-1) The Assistant Secretary introduced Warren Mathison from Moshe Safdie's office to report on progress that had been made on this project. Mr. Mathison said the scheme was still almost the same as it was, and since the Commission had reviewed it, they had done a lot of site work, had many conversations with the neighbors about the streetscape plans, and put in place all the security measures, including the protective barriers at 100 feet. He said they were integrated into the garden wall and into the retail areas along 2nd Street and N Street. The Chairman thought the exterior changes were minimal, and unless there were objections, the project could proceed with further development. There were no objections, and the concept development was unanimously approved. Exhibit D

2. CFA 18/APR/02-5, American Pharmaceutical Association, 2215 Constitution Avenue, N.W. Five-story rear addition. Revised concept. (Previous: S.L. 02-028, 21 February 2002) The Assistant Secretary recalled that the first submission had come in under Shipstead-Luce Act, because the applicant was a private entity, but as the land was owned by GSA, that federal agency was making this submission, under a very complex agreement. He introduced architect George Hartman of Hartman-Cox to make the presentation.

Mr. Hartman said by way of clarification that the American Pharmaceutical Association was the official applicant, and they were making the presentation with the approval of GSA. He said he wanted to touch on two things: one was the Commission's prior request that they study the sight lines from the sidewalk in front of the building. He said they had done this from three places, and he showed photos of the existing condition, perspective drawings with the new addition added, and

a section drawing with sight lines drawn in. He commented that when looking directly over the center bay of the Pope building there would be no impact at all; looking over the wings, the addition would become visible if it weren't for the trees.

The second thing Mr. Hartman talked about was the joint between the Pope building and the new addition, which had been of some concern to the Commission. He said their solution had been to use a double revetment between the two buildings, and he showed a drawing to make this clear.

The third item Mr. Hartman discussed was the material. Noting that the Pope building was marble, he said the addition would be limestone or cast stone in a color just a little darker than the limestone of the State Department building behind.

The Chairman commended Mr. Hartman on the sensitive way he had approached the design of the addition, especially given its close proximity to the Lincoln Memorial. He said the Commission understood that an addition had been intended from the beginning, but had always been concerned as to what form it would take. He commented on another project involving a Beaux-Arts building–the building of the huge new convention center directly behind the old Carnegie Library, soon to reopen as the City Museum. He said he was worried that the comparatively small building would end up looking like a toy, but was surprised that the sight lines were such that from street level a lot of the views of the convention center were blocked. He thought that in the same way the original Pope building could hold its own against both the addition and the State Department. He then asked for comments from the community.

Attorney Whayne Quin, although not from the community, asked to clarify one of the legal ramifications of the case. He said GSA had not approved the design but had consented to the process.

Dorothy Miller, ANC representative from the area, asked to speak. She said the project had not yet come before the ANC but she would report on it to her commissioners, and would appreciate being sent some material.

A motion to approve the revised concept design was then made by Mr. Capoccia, seconded by the Vice-Chairman, and carried unanimously. Exhibit E

3. CFA 18/APR/02-6, U.S. Court of Military Appeals, 450 E Street, N.W. (Judiciary Square). Replacement chiller and cooling tower. Design. Intern Beth Callow introduced historic preservation consultant Hamilton Morton to discuss this project. Mr. Morton said the new chiller and cooling tower would replace units now located in the basement, which were at the end of their useful lives and were causing high humidity, water problems and damage to the structure of this 1907 landmark building. He commented briefly on the character of the architecture, a classical revival structure in excellent condition with almost completely intact interior spaces. (Elliott Woods, Architect of the Capitol, architect of record; Paul J. Pelz, of Smithmeyer & Pelz, architects of the Library of Congress, consulting architect.) He said a historic structures report had been made in the 1980s and determined that even though renovations were made to the mechanical room in the basement, which Mr. Morton said would be done, it would not be feasible to place the new cooling equipment there; it would have to go outside. Wherever it was placed outside would be visible, and Mr. Morton noted several suggestions. He said the plan he was presenting would place the chiller and cooling tower unit, which would measure 20 by 30 feet, with a height of 4-5 feet, on the west lawn, just north of the axis of the side entrance, and about halfway between the building and the 5th Street sidewalk. He said the structure would have planting around it to mitigate its intrusive qualities, and would be faced with limestone to give it a neutral character.

The members were not pleased with the proposal. Mrs. Brody commented that the kind of

landscaping placed around these structures never really worked, and she and the Chairman both thought that getting it farther away from the axis by moving it up toward E Street, centered on the north half of the facade, would at least help to keep the integrity of the west plaza . The Vice-Chairman thought the project needed some real urban design and landscape talent, and he added that placing the unit parallel to E Street would minimize its intrusiveness on the lawn and ally it more with the busy, commercial nature of that street. Moving it far over to the northwestern edge of the property, aligned with the north facade of the building, was also suggested. In regard to the landscaping, Mrs. Brody recalled a similar installation proposal on 7th Street near the Air and Space Museum that showed more creative thinking. It was agreed unanimously that the placement of the chiller and cooling tower should be disapproved, and Mr. Hamilton was asked to return with a restudy of both its location and the landscaping around it. Exhibit F

4. CFA 18/APR/02-7, Department of Education (FOB 6), Maryland Avenue between 4th and 6th streets, S.W. Guard booths and retractable bollards at garage entrances. Design. Mr. Martínez introduced Ruoke Chen from Hi-Tect Architects & Planners to describe the project. Mr. Chen said the project would replace temporary security measures with permanent installations. He said there would be three retractable bollards at each of the two ramps servicing the underground parking garage on the south side of the building, finished to match the granite walls of the building; there would also be traffic lights at the ends of the existing outer railings of the entrances to warn entering and exiting vehicles. The second part of the project was to install permanent guard booths, and he showed a simulated photograph, noting that the booths had been recessed into the adjoining garden wall and designed to harmonize with the building's architectural style and materials, using a granite base and limestone cap. The members were all enthusiastic about the design and commended Mr. Chen on his work, giving it unanimous approval. Exhibit G

5. CFA 18/APR/02-8 Department of Labor, Frances C. Perkins Building, 200 Constitution Avenue N.W. Replacement handrails. Design. Mr. Martínez said this was a request to replace the railings on the cafeteria terrace because they no longer met the code; there would be a new spacing for the pickets that formed the bottom part of the railing, a heavier top rail and a horizontal bar between that and the middle section strip of masonry. He showed drawings and said the staff thought the impact would be minimal and had no objection to the change. The staff's only question was whether the other railings on the building should be changed to match the new design. He introduced Donald Gangloff with the firm of Oudens & Knoop, Architects, to answer questions. Ms. Diamonstein asked if there were any safety problems with the other railings, and Mr. Gangloff said that at this point he didn't know, that the question had not come up. The Chairman did not think it necessary to change all the other railings, unless a safety problem emerged, because the new ones would essentially be in shadow most of the time and their slightly different design would not be noticed. There were no more questions, and the new railing design was unanimously approved. Exhibit H

D. District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority

CFA 18/APR/02-9, St. Elizabeths Hospital (East Campus), 2700 Martin Luther King, Jr., Avenue, S.E. Replacement water storage facility. Design. The Assistant Secretary introduced Wayne Scott from the architectural firm of McKissack & McKissack and engineer Jim Poirier from Baker Kiln, consultants to the Water and Sewer authority, to present this project. Before the discussion began, Mr. Lindstrom noted that the Commission had received a letter from

the Park Service expressing concern over the siting of this tower on the Anacostia ridge because of its visibility from a number of important places. Mr. Poirier was then asked to begin.

Mr. Poirier said the southern portion of Anacostia had experienced low pressure problems, and they had really become exasperating for St. Elizabeths, Hadley Hospital, and other places in the area. Also, there was a problem with the existing storage tank, which had to be maintained full if adequate pressure was to be achieved, and this had the potential for causing water quality problems. To rectify these problems, they were proposing an elevator storage tank on the St. Elizabeths site; it would increase pressure in that area, provide better fire protection, let them utilize other existing storage, and improve pressure at St. Elizabeths by allowing them to get rid of their present storage tank and pump station which were inadequate for the new facilities they were building. There were questions for Mr. Poirier about why the tower had to be so high, and he explained the reasons before turning the presentation over to Wayne Scott to discuss the architectural and aesthetic ramifications of this required behemoth.

Mr. Scott said that in siting the tower, they had tried to develop a relationship between it, the existing buildings, and the open space around them; he said they were able to locate it in the open space and back it up into the existing mature tree growth. He said it would be 38 feet higher than the existing tank.

The Chairman asked Mr. Poirier if he was aware of the Park Service's letter, and he said both he and Mr. Scott had talked to Park Service representatives and discussed their concerns. The Chairman noted the concerns about the signage on the tower, the antennae that might be attached to it, and especially its visibility from distant points, which they thought might be clarified by sight-line studies. He said he agreed the "St. Elizabeths" sign should come off but did not object to the design. He asked for comments from the members, and Mrs. Nelson said she hoped it could be made less blocky and more sculptural, since it was going to be so visible. Mr. Scott said the precast panel used for the outside could be toned down in brightness by using a dark aggregate, and they could certainly remove the logo. Ms. Diamonstein asked if it had to project out at the top as he had designed it, and he said it did. He also pointed out that the visibility from within the St. Elizabeths campus was quite limited; it was from a distance that visibility became a problem.

The Chairman asked John Parsons if he would like to comment, and Mr. Parsons said he wanted to urge a great deal of caution. He pointed out the promontory of the Fort Circle Park System, noting that most of the city's water facilities were below grade in reservoirs in these Fort Circle locations, like Fort Reno, for example. This one, however, would penetrate the skyline, like the National Cathedral, so he urged a visual analysis–balloon tests or whatever was required to be sure that a decision would not be made that would be regretted in the future. He said the Park Service had just learned about this project the day before, so was not really prepared to testify on such short notice.

The Vice-Chairman said this structure was really public art; it was going to be seen around the city, and it needed as much design attention as did the scaffolding that was placed on the Washington Monument recently. He thought that what had been presented, unless there was some good engineering reason for the form, was not acceptable as a piece of sculpture. Mr. Scott said he understood what Mr. Robinson was saying and would really like to do a sculptural tower; he said what they had tried to do was to blend this large object in as much as possible with the historic site and minimize the impact. Mr. Robinson commented that this tower would be the place marker, the dominant element, for St. Elizabeths Hospital. Ms. Diamonstein said she agreed with both Mrs. Nelson's and the Vice-Chairman's points about the need for a piece of sculpture; she said it was going to be impossible to make it less visible, so its aesthetic appeal should be maximized. She thought this might be the chance to involve architects, engineers, and artists and find a successful

resolution to this problem. Mr. Poirier said there were alternatives to the shape presented that could be looked at with the Park Service and the Commission

The Chairman closed the discussion by saying that while it was obvious that the proposed design could not be approved, he wanted to encourage the applicants to look at options, and if there could be a competition for the design, that would be a fascinating thing to experience. One thing was certain: given the required height, the tower was not going to become invisible, no matter where it was put. Exhibit I

(The meeting was adjourned for lunch at 12:13 p.m and reconvened at 1:05 p.m.)

E. District of Columbia Public Schools/U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

CFA 18/APR/02-10, Bell Multicultural High School/Lincoln Multicultural Middle School, 3145 Hiatt Place, N.W./3101 16th Street, N.W. New combined school building. Final. (Previous: CFA 20/SEP/01-15) The Assistant Secretary recalled the approval of the concept design in September and then introduced architect Pat Higgins from the SHW Group to present the final designs.

Mr. Higgins said the drawings were about 90 to 95 percent complete and they hoped to go out for construction bids in the near future and begin construction the first of July. By way of review, he pointed out the location of both schools, noted the demolition plans and the construction of a new building that would house both schools, with a community element running through the center. He showed elevations and said the basic material would be a red brick with some tan brick accents. The base of the building would be cast stone, and there would be a cast stone band going around three sides of the building which would eventually become a frieze of student art work, one panel being added each year. He said the glass would be tinted to reduce glare in the classrooms, and he showed a sample. Ms. Diamonstein asked if it could be lighter, to open the school up a little more and also to make the interior more pleasant for the students. Mr. Higgins said that would not be a problem. There were no other questions, and the final plans were unanimously approved. Exhibit J

F. District of Columbia Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs

1. Old Georgetown Act

Appendix I. The Appendix was approved without objection.

2. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. S.L. 02-056, 5800 block* Oregon Avenue, N.W. (Lot 2). New single-family dwelling. Concept. (* number not assigned) The Assistant Secretary introduced architect Scott Stinson to discuss his design for this house. He said he believed the Commission had seen a different design for a house on this property, one that was for a somewhat larger structure in a slightly different style. He said the property sloped steeply up from front to rear, and he noted that most houses on Oregon Avenue had garages in the basement and steps up to the first floor; he said this house would continue that arrangement. He showed elevation drawings and said the material would be brick, with a copper roof on the front porch and asphalt shingles on the main roof, which was primarily a hip roof with gables in the front and rear. Ms. Diamonstein had some

questions about windows that did not line up, and Mr. Stinson said he would do what he could to remedy that, but in some cases it might be difficult. It was noted that the roof of a projecting bay was intended to be asphalt shingles, and Mr. Stinson was asked if he could change it to copper without incurring any major expense; he said that would not be a problem. The Chairman asked if the garage door could be articulated in some way and also toned down in color so that it didn't appear to be such a large white object; Mr. Stinson said he really hadn't designed the door yet and would be happy to take those suggestions. With the foregoing recommendations, the design was then unanimously approved. Exhibit K

(The agenda order was changed, and the Shipstead-Luce Appendix discussed next.)

c. Appendix II. The Assistant Secretary said he would like to note several items. The first was item S.L. 02-053, the apartment building at 300 Massachusetts Avenue N.W., for which the Commission had approved the concept design. He said the working drawings showed that it had been nicely detailed, conforming to the approved concept, and landscaping had been added, which would be an enhancement to the building. He commented briefly on the work at the Embassy of Luxembourg (an especially fine building by Jules Henri de Sibour), noting that it dealt only with alterations to an areaway to provide exterior access to the basement (S.L. 02-061).

The only item he thought needed some review was the request for exterior renovation and window replacement at the Embassy of Latvia, formerly the Alice Pike Barney Studio House at 2306 and 2308 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., one of the most notable of the historic houses on Sheridan Circle, designed in 1902 by Waddy Wood, a prominent local architect of the period. He said architect Scott Stinson, a former owner, and preservation architect Hyman Myers were present to answer questions. Mr. Lindstrom said the Friends of Barney Studio House had submitted a letter enumerating concerns about the current proposal, which involved adapting the building for embassy use, replacing the windows in kind, adding a new door on the side wall, opening up the very narrow driveway, and extending the fire emergency stair to the rooftop. He said the embassy wanted to maintain the lower two floors as historic interiors and keep their office space confined to the upper floors, hence the need for the fire stair extension. The new side door would avoid needless wear and tear on the front door and vestibule, and would open onto a service stair. The Chairman asked if the public would be allowed into the house at any time, and Mr. Stinson said the embassy planned to have the house open approximately once a month. There was a discussion with the preservation architect, Mr. Myers, which is attached as Exhibit L, after which the concept design was approved. Mr. Lindstrom said the architects would come back with the final drawings and a permit application.

The Shipstead-Luce Appendix was then approved without objection

The Commission returned to Administration item I.A., approval of the minutes of the 21 March meeting. The Chairman said he had made several minor revisions after the draft had been sent out, and went over them for the other members' approval. There were no objections to his changes, and the revised minutes were unanimously approved.

The Secretary brought up another administrative item not on the agenda: the coming deadline for submission of the members' confidential financial disclosure reports; he said they were due on 15 May, the day before the next meeting.

Before the last agenda item was discussed, the Commission listened to Peteris Vinkelis, counselor and deputy chief of mission at the Latvian Embassy, who had just arrived. He said he was sorry to have missed the presentation on the Barney Studio House, but wanted to say they were looking forward to the restoration and thought they had hired the best people to do it. The Chairman

agreed, saying that he knew Mr. Myers well, having worked with him at the National Gallery of Art and on other projects. He told Mr. Vinkelis that the Commission was very pleased with the Latvian government's decision to keep the historic interior intact and with the appropriateness of the renovation for office use; he noted that Ms. Diamonstein, who had just left the meeting, was particularly complimentary to the architect. Mr. Brown and the other members then thanked Mr. Vinkelis for taking the time to come to the meeting.

F. District of Columbia Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs (continued)

2. Shipstead-Luce Act

b. S.L. 02-059, 4800 block* Broad Branch Road, N.W. (Lot 34). New single-family dwelling. Concept. (* number not assigned) The Assistant Secretary introduced Vivian Fernandes, designer of the proposed house. Ms. Fernandes said this was a very preliminary submission, that she did not yet have a survey or a topographic map, and therefore, no contour model to present. She showed photographs, pointing out the houses on either side, and saying she wanted to tuck the house back as far as possible between these houses, which were built of dark siding and/or brick. She said her house would probably be a combination of stone, stucco, and wood. In answer to questions from the Chairman and Vice-Chairman, she said there were no zoning variances to be obtained, she would save as much vegetation as possible, and would replace any trees that had to be taken down for construction. The Chairman was concerned that the garage had to be in front facing the park, but Ms. Fernandes explained that they had tried a side approach but found that the large turning circle required would mean clearing a lot of vegetation.

The Chairman asked if the staff had any objections, and Mr. Lindstrom said they did not, that at this point it seemed that the proposed placement on the lot was a good one. He thought Ms. Fernandes should come back with another concept submission when she had her topo map, a schematic design, massing study, and material selection. Mrs. Brody suggested that she talk to the neighbors about her plans before she went any further. The Chairman and the other members agreed with these suggestions, and the preliminary concept submission was unanimously approved. Exhibit K

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Signed,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT A

30 April 2002

Dear General Kelley:

During its meeting of 18 April 2002, the Commission reviewed a revised design and site for the proposed In Memory project plaque addition to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial and gave it their unanimous approval.

The members were pleased that the collaboration between the ABMC and the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Foundation resulted in a successful proposal. The designers are complimented on their thoughtful way of incorporating this commemorative plaque into the existing landscape so that it does not distract from the other memorial elements and, in fact, will enhance the plaza of the Three Servicemen Statue with the small extension of the paving stones. We look forward to its completion.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

General Paul X. Kelley, USMC (Ret.)
Chairman, American Battle Monuments Commission
Courthouse Plaza II, Suite 501
2300 Clarendon Boulevard
Arlington, VA 22201

cc: Terry Carlstrom, NPS
John Parsons, NPS
Ken Pond, ABMC
J. C. Cummings, AIA
Jan Scruggs, VVMF

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

30 April 2002

EXHIBIT B

Dear Mr. Carlstrom:

At its meeting on 18 April 2002, the Commission was provided with an informational presentation by the Martin Luther King, Jr. National Memorial Project Foundation on potential modifications to the scheme that won the design competition for the memorial. The members agreed that the basic concept for memorializing Dr. King in the winning scheme by the ROMA Group was appropriate but thought the design needed further development.

A number of modifications were discussed, including: the removal of the commemorative niches; the elimination of the pedestrian bridge across the opening in the "Mountain of Despair"; the removal of the walkways above the curved wall; the reduction of the wall's overall height; the addition of secondary entrances/exits at the ends of the curved plaza; a slight modification to the radius of the curved wall to pull it away from Independence Avenue; and the realignment of the "Stone of Hope" so that the figurative carving of Dr. King faces south. All were thought to be reasonable modifications and others will undoubtably come to light as the scheme evolves.

It was acknowledged that there is much to be done, and the members hope that as the design develops it will continue in a direction that keeps the memorial's form clear and concise yet maintains the message. The Commission looks forward to working with the design team, the Foundation, and the National Park Service in addressing the suggested modifications and refinements to the memorial's design.

Please submit a revised concept design for review when ready. As always, the staff is available for assistance should questions arise.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Terry Carlstrom
Regional Director, National Capital Region
National Park Service
1100 Ohio Drive, SW
Washington, DC 20242

cc: John Parsons, NPS
Harry E. Johnson, MLK, Jr. Memorial Foundation
LeRoy Lowery, MLK, Jr. Memorial Foundation
Dr. Ed Jackson, MLK, Jr. Memorial Foundation

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT C

30 April 2002

Dear Mr. Carlstrom:

At its meeting on 18 April 2002, the Commission reviewed and approved the exposed-aggregate concrete walkways for the National Mall provided they match the existing previously installed along Jefferson Drive. The walkways to be paved are the secondary east-west walk along Madison Drive from 3rd to 14th streets, the north-south sidewalks on both sides of 4th Street, and the walk centered on the entrances to the National Gallery of Art and the Air and Space Museum.

Although it was not discussed in the meeting, the Commission encourages the Park Service to develop a scheme to eliminate the unsightly sandbags surrounding the Metro tunnel air vents on both sides of 7th Street. We understand there has been a problem in the past with infrequent flooding of these air shafts and suggest that the installation of a permanent perimeter drain be considered. One that is flush with the grate and connected directly to the Mall's storm water system could be constructed around each air vent. Even improving the curb drains or adding additional drains along the street could help alleviate the flooding problem. The Commission would be willing to consider any unintrusive scheme to do away with the sandbags and further improve the appearance of this portion of the Mall.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Terry Carlstrom
Regional Director
National Capital Region
National Park Service
1100 Ohio Drive, SW
Washington, DC 20242

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT D

30 April 2002

Dear Mr. McGill:

During its 18 April 2002 meeting the Commission was presented with the developing design for the new headquarters building for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, to be located at the intersection of New York and Florida avenues. The members were pleased with the project's progress and direction and unanimously approved the submission.

The Commission looks forward to reviewing the final construction plans and details and offers the assistance of the staff should any question arise. Please submit the final drawings with material samples when ready.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Michael McGill
Senior Project Manager
U.S. General Services Administration
Public Buildings Service, NCR
Portfolio Management Division
301 7th Street, SW, Room 7600
Washington, DC 20407-0001

cc: Moshe Safdie, FAIA, Moshe Safdie and Associates. Inc.
Warren Mathison, AIA, Moshe Safdie and Associates. Inc.
Mignon R. Anthony, Director, New Building Projects, ATF

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT E

30 April 2002

Dear Ms. Czapek:

During its meeting of 18 April 2002, the Commission reviewed a revised concept for the proposed five-story addition to the rear of the American Pharmaceutical Association's historic building at 2215 Constitution Avenue, NW and approved the modifications to the design. The additions of the small reveal and setback will help to further distinguish the existing building from the new addition. The additional sight-line studies were helpful in determining the project's visual impact from the National Mall and Constitution Avenue.

Please submit final construction documents with material samples when ready. The staff is available to review any changes and to assist you and the design team should questions arise.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Ms. Nancy Czapek
Acting Director
Office of Property Disposal
US General Services Administration
301 7th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20407-0001

cc: Roger Browning, American Pharmaceutical Association
George Hartman, AIA, Hartman-Cox Architects
Whayne Quin, Holland & Knight

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT F

30 April 2002

Dear Mr. McGill:

The Commission reviewed the design for the proposed chiller and cooling tower enclosure for the U.S. Court of Military Appeals located at 450 E Street, NW, during its meeting of 18 April 2002. The members thought the proposed location appeared somewhat arbitrary in the west yard--not aligning with any part of the courthouse. They recommended adjusting the enclosure's location so that it is either centered on the northern half of the west facade of the courthouse or placed over at the western edge of the site in alignment with the north facade of the building. In addition, rotating the enclosure 90 degrees with the longest side facing north would allow more of the west yard to be preserved. The surrounding landscaping will be critical to the installation's success and should be carefully studied.

Please submit a revised design for review when ready. Our next meetings are scheduled for 16 May and 20 June. As always, the staff is available for assistance should you have questions.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Michael McGill
Senior Project Manager
U.S. General Services Administration
Public Buildings Service, NCR
Portfolio Management Division
301 7th Street, SW, Room 7600
Washington, D.C. 20407-0001

cc: M. Hamilton Morton, Jr., AIA

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT G

30 April 2002

Dear Mr. McGill:

At its meeting on 18 April 2002, the Commission reviewed and unanimously approved the submission for the installation of retractable bollards and guard booths at the two garage entrances to the Department of Education main headquarters building (FOB6) on Maryland Avenue between 4th and 6th streets, NW. The members found the design of the booths to be harmonious with the architecture of the building and were pleased with the care the design team took to integrate the booths into the existing planter walls.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Michael McGill
Senior Project Manager
U.S. General Services Administration
Public Buildings Service, NCR
Portfolio Management Division
301 7th Street, SW, Room 7600
Washington, DC 20407-0001

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT H

30 April 2002

Dear Mr. McGill:

During its 18 April 2002 meeting, the Commission reviewed and unanimously approved the replacement handrails for the France C. Perkins Building, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW. This project will improve the level of safety provided by the building's balcony railings and will be harmonious with the architectural style.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Michael McGill
Senior Project Manager
U.S. General Services Administration
Public Buildings Service, NCR
Portfolio Management Division
301 7th Street, SW, Room 7600
Washington, D.C. 20407-0001

cc: Norton B. Crichlow, GSA

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT I

30 April 2002

Dear Mr. Marcotte:

During its meeting of 18 April 2002, the Commission reviewed the submission for the proposed elevated water storage tank on the grounds of St. Elizabeths Hospital. The members were concerned that the height and size of the proposed tank would be too prominent on the crest of the Anacostia ridge. It was recommended that additional sight-lines and visibility studies be conducted to determine the full visual impact of the proposal.

The need for increased water pressure in this part of the city is understood, but any viable alternative schemes that could lower the height of the tank should be considered. As for the design of the tank as proposed, the members wished for a form that was more elegant, less "industrial looking" and more sensitive to the historic campus of the hospital. If the structure cannot be reduced in height, then, as one member suggested, it should be considered a "special design project" to generate an acceptable and interesting solution that would enhance the hospital campus and become a landmark for the community.

Please submit additional visibility studies and a revised proposal when ready. The Commission provides the services of its staff should questions arise.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Michael S. Marcotte, PE
Chief Engineer/Deputy General Manager
District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority
5000 Overlook Avenue, SW
Washington, D.C. 2003

cc: Wayne Scott, McKissack & McKissack

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS 17 MAY 1910

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
441 F STREET, N.W., SUITE 312
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-2728

202-504-2200
202-504-2195 FAX

EXHIBIT J

30 April 2002

Dear Mr. Block:

During its meeting of 18 April 2002, the Commission reviewed and approved the final design for the consolidated Bell-Lincoln Multicultural High and Middle schools at 3101 16th Street, Northwest. The construction drawings conform to the approved concept design. The material samples were reviewed at the same time and approved, although the members found the brick and mortar colors difficult to judge in the small samples shown. In addition the members recommend that a less-tinted glass be used to allow the building's interior to be more visible, so as to avoid the windows appearing blank and vacant. It will be helpful to have a material sample mock-up panel erected on the site for review by the Commission prior to the construction of the walls. The staff is available to assist you with this inspection.

We look forward to the day when the building opens as one of the District's premier schools and commend the architects and their clients on the successful development of this unusually complex school project.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Stanley N. Block, P.E.
Chief, Design Management Branch
Engineering Division
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 1715
Baltimore, MD 21203-1715

cc: Robert Mustain, Army Corps of Engineers
Sarah Woodhead, D.C. Public Schools
J. Patrick Higgins, AIA, SHW Group, Inc.

EXHIBIT K

18 April 2002

SHIPSTEAD-LUCE
AGENDA ITEM EXHIBIT

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 02-056	5800 Block * Oregon Avenue, NW Barry Zuckerman Properties, Inc * number not assigned	Single Family Dwelling - Concept

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to the concept design for a proposed new single family dwelling as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 15 April 2002. Recommend a metal roof for the projecting bay window and a wooden garage door. File new submission of working drawings, material samples, and landscape plan with permit application, for review by the Commission when ready.

S.L. 02-059	4800 Block * Broad Branch Road, NW Robert Rose Residence * number not assigned	Single Family Dwelling - Concept

RECOMMENDATION: No objection to the concept for the siting of a proposed new single family dwelling with garage on Lot 34 in Square 2272 facing Broad Branch Road as shown in supplemental drawings received and dated 18 April 2002. File new concept submission for the building, including design development drawings with details, landscape plans and material samples, for review by the Commission when ready.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Good. Well, should we hear from the architect?

MR. MYERS: We have a client which is a wonderful client in that he understands, they understand, the Latvians understand very much the historical nature of the building. We have gone through with them, through the building, very carefully and they have agreed to preserve I would say 99 percent of the building, especially taking care of all the major public accesses, including the entranceway and all the major public rooms on the two floors that are so important to this building.

The biggest change to this building that we saw was before even Mr. Stinson owned the building, all the furniture was taken out separately and I'd just like to show you something.

MS. DIAMONDSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: Was this house owned by the Smithsonian? I was trying to remember. I know that I've been to dinner there.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Yeah.

MS. DIAMONDSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: That's what it looked like.

MR. MYERS: Right. We think that it's a shame that all of this interior--

MS. NELSON: A huge shame.

MR. MYERS: Fifty percent was the environment that was created by Alice Pike Barney for the studio.

MS. DIAMONDSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: Where is that material now?

MR. MYERS: It was sold at auction here.

MS. NELSON: So it's around the area maybe.

MR. STINSON: When I purchased the building about a year and a half ago the owner of the building at the time auctioned the furniture off separately from the building.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: The auction house might be able to help track it down. I mean if there were a few key things that were--

MR. STINSON: I've talked to the Latvian government. Their furnishing plans are not quite set yet but I've talked to them about the possibility of getting in touch with a Weshler's and trying to get a few or the more important pieces.

We were able to save a couple of interesting things. The dining room was done in a set that was carved in Henry Frye's studio in Cincinnati and we

managed to save the two-panel screen that went with that, but all of the dining room furniture, which was also part of Frye's work was sold off.

MS. DIAMONDSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: I think his suggestion is noteworthy because it was the collage of the house, rather than it being--it was so idiosyncratic. Rather than it being mere pieces, it bespoke a particular taste and time.

MR. STINSON: Actually, none of the furniture was particularly rare. It was sort of the way Alice Barney lived her life, was to go collect things for their appearance, rather than their value. She was quite the artist.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: It could be done again.

MS. BRODY: And you've just sold the house?

MR. STINSON: Yes.

MS. BRODY: The house was sold to--

MR. MYERS: Latvian Embassy.

MS. DIAMONDSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: But you didn't live in it?

MR. STINSON: No.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: The real shocker is that the Smithsonian ever off-loaded this. They're supposed to be stewards of our heritage and they have this unique property and they just dumped it.

MR. MYERS: Incredible to us.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: It really is.

MR. MYERS: But I want to say that the Latvians have agreed that what is left, the stairways, the woodwork, even much of the painting work that was done, would all be maintained and restored.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: All of her inscriptions over the--

MR. MYERS: Exactly, exactly. It really is quite a feat to have a client who really recognizes that. This is a great thing.

MS. DIAMONDSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: Well, we know about the literary tradition in Latvia but we didn't know, at least I didn't, about their interest in historic preservation. And as you remind me, I'm aware of what a fine historic preservation architect you are so I wondered if you read this letter and if you could respond to some of their--things that not only are legitimate but things you must do for a public structure. Why don't you just go down their little bullets?

MR. MYERS: Sure. The first one is lighting scheme. I've been to the house both in the daytime and at night to see how it would work and how it would function. There are two gigantic trees planted originally by Alice on the front of the house and here they are, tiny little twigs, and now they have grown up to enormous trees. They really cover the facade and at night it's very dark.

All we wanted to do is to put a little bit of light--we want to be very sensitive to this--in the bottom section of the house. I've outlined it here.

MR. STINSON: Also you can see it here.

MR. MYERS: If you go there at night you'll see that that it absolutely needs it just to pass by the house and look like it's alive.

MS. DIAMONDSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: And what would that little bit of lighting look like?

MR. MYERS: We would like to put it behind some shrubs right along the front at the ground level to just put a globe light down here, not very much.

There are two places that we would like more light on the facade. That is the embassy sign, so it can be read, and that would be at this position. And the Smithsonian had put up a sign showing that it was the--

MR. STINSON: At the request of the [inaudible].

MR. MYERS: And that's there now where the Latvian sign would go and that would be put on the other side of the building, maintaining it, because it does recognize the historic character of the building.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Oh, yeah, that's important.

MR. MYERS: And we would like to just highlight that a little bit.

We'd like to then go up to the top of the house and--oh, and the tile panel there. There is a wonderful tile panel in the facade that is original. Again these are going to be subtle. These are not spotlights at all. These are very subtle things. But otherwise, you don't see them at all.

MS. DIAMONDSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: What are they? What is the lamp that you're talking about?

MS. NELSON: What's in the tile panel?

MR. MYERS: What's in the tile panel?

MS. DIAMONDSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: No, I remember the tile panel but these lights that you're going to put on the facade, how do you affix them?

MR. MYERS: They would be in the ground, washing up. It's very low to the ground where all these functions are. We'd like to light the inside of that arch to look like the building is occupied at night. The embassy is closed at night and we'd like to give a little light in the facade. If we just light this balcony up here it will really look like it's still operating and somebody's in the house.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Good.

MR. MYERS: So that's the minimal amount we want to do.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Doesn't sound too scary.

MR. MYERS: The next thing was that later on, after the house was built, Alice bought the adjacent property and in 1921 built a garage on that property. She then enclosed it sometime later with garden walls, as you can see here, for the entrance to the driveway.

If you look carefully at this picture and at that window comparison you will see that the wall has been hit many times by trucks and cars coming into that driveway. It's just too narrow.

So what we wanted to do was to rebuild it accurately, not inaccurately, as has been done in the past, and move it over one foot on each side, centering the opening as it was before because it is all new now, not original, anyway, and does not quite follow--they got the idea but not the detail. We'd like--

MS. DIAMONDSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: So you're recommending a two-foot-wide expansion?

MR. MYERS: One foot on each side. That makes, on either side of that opening, a six-inch change, which is not very much. I looked at it and it looks like we can do it exactly right. We can use the original window in the house, which is in perfect condition, to make the change accurate. So that's the other thing we would like to do.

So that takes care of the exterior, the lighting. Inside the foyer she did use a lot of specially made tile from Doylestown. That tile is on the floor here. We think it's important. It can hardly be seen now and we'd like to put a small bit of light in there really to just bring it up. Most of the light would be on the floor. There would be a little bit on the sides where she has installed some artwork. Again we'd like to keep all the original

fixtures intact and just add this lighting inside, again a very subtle way of making it look like not a dark opening any longer but an opening that's welcoming and a little bit lighter.

We have some likely to be satellite antennas, one of the things that have attacked historic buildings many times, as we've seen in the past. And if you go up on the roof of the Pike Barney House you will see other antenna all around you from other embassies and we don't want to do it like it's been done before. We believe we can put up the antenna--it's only a two-foot radius, not very big compared to all the other ones around. We'd like to set it back from the roof so that you wouldn't be able to see it from Sheridan Circle. So that's an important criteria.

We have looked at it. It's something that we are concerned about and we think that with a small one, it will not be objectionable.

That's the satellite antenna. We don't believe you'll be able to see it, as mentioned here, from Rock Creek Park. I went and drove down Rock Creek Park and looked up the hill. It's a very steep angle and it's a very long hill. There will be no way, I don't believe, that you could see it at all from Rock Creek Park, for anyone in Rock Creek Park.

The driveway wall we've talked about. We are considering adding new gates. That may be a security measure, to put gates on the opening. It's now a wide opening. I don't see any pintles there from any previous gate, as far as I can tell. So this would be a new addition.

We have not designed them yet. We want to talk to the embassy people about security and that would be forthcoming. We think they could be iron. If they have to be solid we would do wood and iron.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: They'd be opened with a clicker?

MR. MYERS: Probably, yes.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Visually it's a plus, to mask the cars.

MR. MYERS: Yes. I would expect that there would be more service vehicles now than ever before and therefore if they were closed, you just wouldn't see them at all.

We do not expect to make any more paving. The driveway itself is wide enough except that people

edge over on the driveway and hit the walls. So we'd like to keep the driveway and not increase the paving area. So that again would be a good thing. We'd just make the opening wider.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Fire escape.

MR. MYERS: Fire escapes. I have a photograph here of the fire escape. We have also an engineering report for code analysis. What we found out was if you look at the fire escape now there is one back there and believe it or not, as awful as fire escapes can look, this one happens to hide itself very well in the back, as you can see on these photographs. It is an open fire escape and with the trees out you'll hardly notice it. Just take a look at that. You'll see on the top of it there is a ladder for the upper stories. Unsafe and the code people report to us that a lot of people would be frightened to go out there on a ladder in case of fire.

We're proposing to take the same construction and just go up one more floor with that open construction. I think it'll be hardly a change. The only persons who could see it possibly are somebody in the garden in the back. So I think it's an absolutely minimal change to that rear.

The next item is the construction of an entry door and that may be on the same--

CHAIRMAN BROWN: The same smiling introducer here.

MR. MYERS: Right.

MS. DIAMONDSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: A smiling seller.

MR. STINSON: Slightly better dressed.

MR. MYERS: That wall is a party wall. It's this wall of the house. Originally it was meant to be a party wall of the next property and designed such, with only the finished material, stucco, out front and then a brick party wall.

When she bought the next property, that's when they agreed there would be no building there. So what they did was because it was a poor brick, still a poor brick, they covered it with stucco. They covered it with stucco in order to maintain the waterproof quality of that party wall and that's what you see in the photograph.

The bottom portion is the foundation wall. That's the only portion we would cut, and at the same level. We would keep that level intact and put a

flush door to match the color of the stucco in that sides and therefore I think would be very minimal.

By adding this door, all the service then could easily go up the service stair and not have to come through, as they have now done, through the front of the building.

MS. DIAMONDSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: Is there a panel door that you can put on top of the metal door?

MR. MYERS: You could--

MS. DIAMONDSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: To respond to their--

MR. MYERS: I don't think it's a good idea.

MS. DIAMONDSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: Once it's over the metal door it isn't an issue.

MR. MYERS: No, no, but I don't think it's a good idea aesthetically. I think if you look at that drawing you'd want it just to disappear.

MS. DIAMONDSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: Very clean door.

MR. MYERS: Very clean.

MR. STINSON: We will be reconstructing some of the other doors in the house in a modern way. We could do this as one of the historic doors but it's probably not the right place.

MR. MYERS: I think to introduce a panel door would make people think that it might have been original and how strange it would be in the side party wall.

MS. DIAMONDSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: Treating it as a service or cellar door, and that's what it is.

MR. MYERS: That's what it is and you really won't see it if you paint it the right color, to match the stucco.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Yes.

MR. MYERS: So I just don't agree with the concept.

MS. DIAMONDSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: I do think there's a concern that the designs for proposed new gates should be reviewed.

MR. MYERS: I agree.

So if you look at where that west elevation is, it'll literally be a door right in there. We won't go higher than that concrete foundation portion of the wall. I think it'll be almost not seen.

Was there anything else that I missed?

MR. STINSON: Site lighting for the parking area.

MS. NELSON: Security lighting?

MR. MYERS: Yes, security lighting and site lighting. Right now we have some inoperable fixtures, only because you can't get up there to relamp them and to fix them, and we would like to just put them back where they were. Right now we have no new security lighting in that area. We just want to use what's there. So there will be no change. We literally put in the bulb.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Okay. Anyone have any further questions or objections? I'm delighted they're taking it this seriously. I think it's in good hands.

MS. DIAMONDSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: A good custodian with the embassy and an excellent architect, who is certainly responding to our and the Alice Pike Barney friends, I assume relatives, too. Is it?

CHAIRMAN BROWN: Well, no. The friends, it's a professor at Berkeley, there's quite a prestigious group of American art historians who pleaded with the Smithsonian not to shoot themselves in the foot.

MS. DIAMONDSTEIN-SPIELVOGEL: In any case I think that in principle, at least I think that all of you are on the right track and there are several designs that should be submitted for final approval but other than that, it appears to me--

CHAIRMAN BROWN: And probably should be handled as a Shipstead-Luce appendix item.

MR. LINDSTROM: This is a concept submission. They will come back with the permit for this work and submit the drawings.

CHAIRMAN BROWN: All right, the court is with you. Go in peace. Thank you.